ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to an Office Action mailed on April 29, 2008. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 10 have been amended. Claims 48 has been newly canceled. Claims 41 – 47 were previously cancelled.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 – 7 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barrett et al. ("Barrett") (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,129). This rejection is respectfully traversed, although independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define over the reference. Claims 3, 5 and 10 have been amended for consistency with amended claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> monitoring usage of at least one of a first software application and a first hardware device of said information handling system;
>
> monitoring usage of at least one of a second software application and a second hardware device of said information handling system;
>
> generating a first representation corresponding to actions performed during said usage of said at least one of said first software application and said first hardware device;
>
> generating a second representation corresponding to actions performed during said usage of said at least one of said second software application and said second hardware device;
>
> communicating an association of the first representation to the second representation so as to enable a determination of at least one of prior usage and current usage of the information handling system.

Barrett relates to a system and method for use with a communication and information network for assisting a user in accessing information stored at remote network sites based on the user's past history of network usage. (Abstract)

remarks (10/747,854)

It is alleged in the Office Action that Barret teaches "monitoring usage of resources of an information handling system (see column 7 lines 51 – 56; *"the number of occurrences of the page, i.e., the number of times in the past that this Web page has been downloaded is computed. Preferably, the date and time of the prior downloads, or some suitable indication of how recently each download took place, is also obtained, and user later"*); generating a first representation corresponding to a first item of usage (see Figure 9, showing representations corresponding to items of usage); generating a second representation corresponding to a second item of usage (see Figure 9, showing representations corresponding to items of usage); ..."

With respect to "monitoring usages of resources," it is respectfully submitted that "computing the number and times that a Web page has been downloaded" cannot be equated to "monitoring usage of at least one of a first software application and a first hardware device of said information handling system; and monitoring usage of at least one of a second software application and a second hardware device of said information handling system," as recited in amended claim 1. While downloading a Web page may require the use of a software application (e.g. a web browser), "computing the number and times that the Web page has been downloaded" has nothing to do with "monitoring the usage" of the software application used to download the Web page. Further, the cited passage certainly does not contain a teaching or suggestion of monitoring usage of at least one of a <u>first</u> software application and a <u>first</u> hardware device, and at least one of a <u>second</u> software application and a <u>second</u> hardware device, as recited in amended claim 1.

With respect to generating "a first representation and a second representation," Figure 9 of Barrett illustrates a possible display of a succession of other possible web pages from the currently displayed web page. It is respectfully submitted that the cited disclosure of Barrett is not a disclosure of "generating a first representation corresponding to actions performed during said usage of said at least one of said first software application and said first hardware device; and generating a second representation corresponding to actions performed during said usage of said at least one of said second software application and said second hardware device." At best, Barrett merely discloses a single representation of the previous viewing of related web

pages, which is not the "first representation" and the "second representation" as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, since Barrett does not contain an teaching or suggestion of the "first representation" and the "second representation," it is respectfully submitted that Barrett also does not contain a teaching or suggestion of communicating an association of the first representation to the second representation so as to enable a determination of at least one of prior usage and current usage of the information handling system, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2 – 6 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons provide in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett and Bauersfield et al. ("Bauersfield") (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,679). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bauersfield as cited as disclosing "monitoring usage of Internet resources and allowing users to search previously accessed resources."

Claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Bauersfield does not overcome the deficiencies of Barrett discussed above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the proposed combination of Barrett and Bauersfield does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 8 and 9.

Claims 11 – 17, 20 – 27, 30 – 37, 40 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett and Austin (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,569). This rejection is respectfully traversed, although claim 48 has been cancelled for consistency with amended claim 1, discussed above.

Independent claims 11, 21 and 31 each recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the resources of which the usage is monitored comprises devices coupled internally of the information handling system, devices coupled to the information handling system peripherally of the

- 3 -

remarks (10/747,854)

information handling system, devices coupled to the information handling system over a network, and other information handling systems coupled to the information handling system." Independent claims 11, 21 and 31 each relate to monitoring usage of hardware devices, whether the devices are coupled to the information handling system internally, peripherally, or over a network, or are other information handling systems.

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that "Barrett does not explicitly teach that the resources of which the usage is monitored comprises devices coupled internally of the information handling system, devices coupled to the information handling system peripherally of the information handling system." However, it is alleged in the Office Action that "[i]t was well known in the art at the time the invention was made that URLs can point to devices coupled internally of the information handling system, as well as devices coupled to the information handling system peripherally of the information handling system (see Austin column 2 line 63 through column 3 line 9; *The URL can also be a standard Internet URL, such as http, ftp, file etc. As an example, the URL can begin with "file:", signifying that a data file is the source of data. The remainder of the URL comprises a path that is meaningful to the machine where the data file resides. This includes files on the local machine or files addressable within the Internet that are accessible by the local machine. Thus, the Data Socket client allows a program to address data or files locally or from a server, or from a peripheral device.*")" It is further alleged in the Office Action that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the URL resources of Barrett to also point to local and peripheral devices as shown possible by Austin so that the functionality of the invention could be expanded to also include local resources."

Austin merely discloses that a URL beings with a protocol term (i.e., "file:") and comprises a path to a <u>data file</u>. This description is consistent with the well-known definition of "URL" being "an address that can lead you to a <u>file</u> on any computer connected to the Internet anywhere in the world." <u>Newton's Telecom Dictionary</u>, 19th edition, 2003. Thus, "URLs" point to <u>data and files</u>. While the "data and files" may be located locally or remotely on devices coupled to an information handling system, it is respectfully submitted that it is a mischaracterization to suggest that "URLs" point to <u>devices</u>, such that Barrett and Austin teach monitoring the <u>usage of devices</u> coupled to

remarks (10/747,854)

an information handling system internally, peripherally, or over a network. At best, the combination of Barret and Austin discloses monitoring the viewing of web pages or data or other files located locally or remotely on coupled devices. It is respectfully submitted that monitoring the viewing of web pages or data does not equate to monitoring the usage of the resources of an information handling system where those resources are devices coupled internally, peripherally or over a network to the information handling system.

Claims 12 – 17, 20, 22 – 27, 30, 32 – 27 and 40 depend from one of independent claims 11, 21 and 31, and are allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 18, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett, Austin and Bauersfield. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bauersfield as cited as disclosing "monitoring usage of Internet resources and allowing users to search previously accessed resources."

Claims 18, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39 each depend from one of independent claims 11, 21 and 31, discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that Bauersfield does not overcome the deficiencies of Barrett and Austin discussed above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the proposed combination of Barrett, Austin and Bauersfield does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 18, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39.

END REMARKS

remarks (10/747,854)

2006LT:1090:67229:1C:ALEXANDRIA